PROCEEDINGS OF THE ADJOURNED MEETING (15TH) OF THE SENATE HELD IN THE HALL OF THE MAHARAJA'S COLLEGE, MYSORE, ON SATURDAY THE 20TH MARCH 1920 AT 8 A.M.

PRESENT.

Rajamantrapravina H. V. Nanjundayya, Esq., M.A., M.L., C.I.E.,

Vice-Chancellor and Chairman.

1. Mr. N. S. Subba Rao, M.A., Bar.-at-Law.
2. Sir Leslie C. Miller, Kt., C.B.E.
3. Rao Bahadur Mr. M. C. Rangiengar, B.A.
4. Rajakaryaprasakta Rao Bahadur Mr. M. Shama Rao, M.A.
5. ,, J. C. Rollo, M.A.
6. Rajasabhabhushana Dewan Bahadur Mr. C. Srikantesvara Aiyar, B.A., B.L.
7. Dr. Radhakumud Mookerji, M.A., PH.D.
8. Mr. A. R. Wadia, B.A., Bar.-at-Law.
9. Dr. H. B. Mylvaganam, F.R.C.S.
10. Mr. R. Ranga Rao, B.A., B.L.
11. ,, M. Ramachandra Rao, B.A., B.L.
12. ,, P. G. D'Souza, B.A., B.L.
13. ,, B. M. Srikantia, M.A., B.L.
14. ,, B. Venkatanaranappa, M.A.
15. Rajakaryapravina Rao Bahadur Mr. T. V. Arumugam Mudaliar, M.B., C.M.
16. Mr. K. Chandy, B.A.
17. ,, V. Rangaswamy Iyengar, A.C.E., B.C.E.
18. ,, C. S. Balasundaram Iyer, B.A.
19. ,, K. Matthan, B.A.
20. Munir-ul-talim Mr. H. J. Bhabha, M.A.
21. Mr. M. Hiriyanna, M.A., L.T.
22. ,, M. Venkatakrishnayya.
23. ,, S. Venkatesiah, B.A., B.L.
24. Dr. S. Paul Chinnappa, M.A., PH.D.
25. Rajasabhabhushana Mr. Karpur Shrinivasarav, B.SC., L.C.E.
26. Mr. D. Venkataramayya, B.A., L.T.
27. ,, V. Subrahmanya Iyer, B.A., (*Secretary*).

ABSENT.

1. Mr. Thos. Denham, M.A.
2. ,, C. R. Reddy, M.A.
3. ,, E. P. Metcalfe. B.SC.
4. ,, K. R. Seshachar, B.A., B.E.
5. ,, F. L. Usher, B.SC.
6. Dr. Leslie C. Coleman, M.A., PH.D.
7. Mr. V. S. Sambasiva Iyer, B.SC., L.C.E
8. ,, F. R. Sell, M.A.
9. ,, M. T. Narayana Iyengar, M.A.
10. ,, E. G. McAlpine, M.A.
11. ,, A. B. Mackintosh, M.A.
12. ,, K. T. Shah, B.A., BSC., Bar.-at-Law.
13. ,, S. Radhakrishnan, M.A., L.T.
14. The Rev. A. R. Fuller, B.A.
15. Dr. W. F. Smeeth, M.A., D.SC.
16. Mr. B. Venkatesachar, M.A.
17. The Rev. W. H. Thorp, B.A.
18. Mr. S. R. Balakrishna Rao, B.A., LL.B.
19. ,, B. Hanumantha Rao, B.A., I.S.O.
20. Sri K. D. Rukminiamma, B.A.
21. Miss M. L. Butler, B.A.
22. Mr. M. G. Srinivasa Rao, M.A.
23. ,, P. Sampath Iyengar, M.A.
24. ,, R. H. Campbell, C.I.E.
25. ,, S. Cadambi, B.A., L.C.E.
26. ,, C. S. Doraswamy Iyer, B.A., B.L.
27. ,, Mirza M. Ismail, B.A.
28. ,, S. G. Forbes, B.SC., E. & M.E., MEM., A.I.E.E.
29. ,, Nawab Gulam Ahmad Kalami.
30. The Rev. Father Tabard, M.A.
31. Mr. B. Nagappa, Bar.-at-Law.
32. ,, K. Sankara Narayana Rao, M.A., B.L.
33. Praktana Vimarsa Vichakshana Rao Bahadur Mr. R. Narasimhachar M.A.
34. Mr. S. Hiriyannaiya, M.A., B.L.
35. Dr. M. Srinivasa Rao, M.A., M.D., B.SC., D.P.H., F.C.S.
36. Mr. B. Dasappa, B.A.

1. That the following recommendations made by the Composite Board of Studies in Sanskrit, Kannada, Tamil and Telugu at the meeting held on the 21st September 1919, be approved :—

(*a*) That with regard to the suggested modification of the Scheme of Examination in Telugu (Second Language) for the B.A. Degree, (*vide* Resolution VI of the Senate meeting of March 1919) there be no need for three papers and there be only two papers in the subject.

Moved by Mr. M. Shama Rao and seconded by Mr. N. S. Subba Rao.

Fifteen voted for and none against.—*Passed.*

(*b*) That for the M.A. Degree Examination in Kannada as the first language, Sanskrit *or* Tamil or Telugu be allowed to be taken as second language and not Sanskrit *and* Tamil or Telugu.

Moved by Mr. M. Shama Rao and seconded by Mr. N. S. Subba Rao.

Mr. C. S. Balasundaram Iyer, remarked that this was a retrograde step and that the effect of the proposition would be to lighten the course considerably and make the degree cheap. Further as the object was to make provision for the highest degree in Kannada a good working knowledge of Sanskrit was essential as Kannada depended largely upon Sanskrit. He also observed that the change was not for the better and opposed the motion.

Mr. H. J. Bhabha supported Mr. Balasundaram Iyer. Mr. M. C. Rangiengar, also considered that Kannada was intimately connected with Sanskrit and a knowledge of the latter was indispensable.

Messrs. K. Chandy and D. Venkataramaiya also spoke against the proposal of the committee.

Votes were taken, 6 were recorded for and 12 against.—*Lost.*

In view of this resolution, the following course of study, etc., recommended by the committee for the said examination was dropped.

(*c*) That the following be the course of Study, etc., for the said examination:—

A. KANNADA.

(1) Kannada Grammar, historical and descriptive.

NOTE.—The student will be expected to possess a knowledge of the elements of Comparative Philology A text book should be prescribed from time to time under descriptive grammar.

(2) History of Kannada Literature.
(3) Prosody and Poetics.
(4) Prescribed text-books, I paper.
(5) Prescribed text-books, II paper.
(6) Kannada Composition.

Each paper is to be of three hours' duration with a maximum of 100 marks except composition which is to carry 150.

The minimum for a pass is to be 35 per cent in Kannada, 30 per cent in the Second Language and 40 per cent in the aggregate. The minimum for a second class is to be 50 per cent and for a first class 60 per cent of total marks.

The standard of examination in the second language is to be that of the B.A. second language.

B. SECOND LANGUAGE.

(1) Prescribed text-books.

(2) Grammar, History of Literature, Translation into Sanskrit from Kannada, Composition in Tamil or Telugu.

Each paper is to be of three hours' duration with a maximum of 125 marks.

With the permission of the Senate, Mr. C. S. Balasundaram Iyer moved the following:—

"That for the M.A. Degree Examination in Kannada as the first language, Sanskrit *and* Tamil or Telugu be prescribed as additional languages and that the Boards of Studies as a composite Board (with Mr. M. Shama Rao as Convener) be requested to draw up a scheme of studies and examinations for the Course."

Dr. Radhakumud Mookerji seconded.

Fourteen voted for and 2 against.—*Passed.*

2. That a Concurrent Course in Education be instituted to enable students to take Education as one of the two optional subjects toward the B.A. Degree, the course being a cultural one dealing with such aspects of Education as relate to its Philosophy, Science and History, namely:—

(i) Philosophy of Education, including (*a*) Fundamental Principles of Education, (*b*) Theory of Knowledge.

(ii) Psychology, including (*a*) Pure Psychology, (*b*) Experimental Psychology.

(iii) History of Education, including (*a*) Evolution of Educational Ideals, (*b*) Comparative Education.

In moving the Proposition, Dr. S. Paul Chinnappa made the following remarks:—

It was clear from the Government Order of January last on this subject that they wanted both the Concurrent and the Post-graduate courses in Education to be started and that at a very early date. The order also implied that there should be no separate Practising High School and no separate Teachers' College. The details asked for by Government, did not appear to have been submitted. It was, however, clear that the whole question was referred in turn to the Senate.

If the Senate wished to set aside the Government Order, and desired to discuss the merits of the Concurrent course purely out of academic interest, it might be placed before the members as also the claims of the subject of Education for recognition as a cultural subject, on which ground the subject might be considered with a view to its being treated as one of the optional subjects for the B.A. Degree.

The modern Universities of Great Britain and America drew a distinction between "Teaching" and "Education". Teaching was merely class-room technique, while Education connoted a much larger idea. If, by education, the opponents of the Concurrent course meant only teaching, then from their standpoint there was every reason to drop the Concurrent course. But, if by Education they meant what the Universities of London, Leeds, Manchester, some American Universities, Dr. Sadler and his Commission mean, then there ought to be unanimous assent for an optional course in Education for the B.A. Degree.

The subject of Education was one of the human sciences and was closely allied to Philosophy, Sociology and History. For its theoretical content it drew upon branches of Philosophy such as Psychology, Logic and Ethics. Its History was the reflection of contemporary civilisation; its administration hinged on Political Economy and Social politics. The Educational phases of the sciences enumerated above was made into a science of Education which was being studied in the modern Universities of the world for B.A., M.A., Ph.D. and D. Lit. Degrees. That branch of human knowledge known as Education was by no means inferior either in content or mental discipline to any other subject that tradition had forced into the curricula of Universities. It was because of the comprehensiveness of its content and cultural values that in foreign Universities, prospective Engineers, Doctors, Lawyers and business men took courses in Education during their University career.

The objections to a Concurrent course were chiefly due to a want of knowledge of the subject. It was very difficult, nay almost impossible to convince laymen of the cultural values of the subject. They would believe rather in materials sciences and sciences of reckoning as culture giving subjects than in a subject which had vital relations with life.

The advantages of introducing the Concurrent course were many and varied; in the case of a man who did not wish to become a teacher, a knowledge of a subject could not reduce his culture, while its utility to him could never be doubted. To a prospective teacher a knowledge of the subject would be an excellent preparation for his calling.

Such of the members as were entrusted with the work of training teachers felt it difficult to introduce the teacher to larger problems of Education in one short year (which is only of eight months' duration) giving training in the technique of teaching.

The method of organising the optional and post-graduate courses in the University was clearly shown in the pamphlet placed in the hands of members. The creation of a Department of Education as a part of the Maharaja's College was advocated there. The Professor of Education who might be appointed would be in charge of the Faculty and work in the Maharaja's College. He would have considerable autonomy in his own department.

If some classes of the Collegiate High School should be utilised for practising purposes, as Government had desired, the cost of the whole scheme as set out below would not be much.

I. For both the Courses.—		
(i) Professor of Education	...	400—50—700
Assistant Professor	...	200—20—300
Total	...	Rs. 600
(ii) Establishment.—		
Clerk	...	25
Librarian	...	20
3 peons at 9, 8 and 7	...	24
Contingent amount	...	11
Total	...	80
Total cost Rs. 600+80=Rs. 680.		
II. For Post-graduate Course only.—		
(i) Professor of Education	...	400—50—700
Assistant Professor	...	200—20—300
Total	...	Rs. 600

(ii) Establishment.—		
Clerk	...	25
Librarian	...	20
3 peons at 9, 8 and 7	...	24
Contingent amount	...	11
Total		Rs. 80

Total cost Rs. 600+80=Rs. 680.

As the introduction of the Concurrent and Post-graduate courses demanded the same expenditure, *viz.*, Rs. 680, a month or about Rs. 8,200 a year, as that of introducing the post-graduate alone, both the courses might be introduced in the Maharaja's College. If the Concurrent course was also given in the Central College, one Assistant Professor of Education might manage the work and he would cost only Rs. 200 a month extra or Rs. 2,400 a year. The experiment might be tried only in the Maharaja's College for the present.

He felt that the question presented no great difficulty and thought that it might have been solved long ago instead of its being allowed to lie over. He hoped that this long debated question would be settled soon and the Faculty instituted next July, as the graduates under training were anxious to get university recognition.

Mr. H. J. Bhabha seconded.

In opposing Dr. Chinnappa's proposal for the introduction of "Education" as an optional in the B.A. curriculam, Mr. J. C. Rollo urged that the student could not at that stage profit by a course so theoretic and technical in character, and that his work would be reduced to unintelligent memorising. Further, the course consisted largely of fragments relating to other optionals such as philosophy, and had no unity in itself; thus it was far inferior in disciplinary value to the existing optionals,—not, as Dr. Chinnappa had contended culturally on a level with them. Mr. Rollo also objected to the particular optional course proposed by Dr. Chinnappa as tending, as did much modern theorising about teaching, rather to remove the future teacher from due understanding of, and contact with, the child than to equip him as a practical teacher.

Mr. D. Venkataramayya opposed the motion.

He said that it was not desirable to have a Concurrent course in Education at present as there was not much likelihood of Under-Graduates electing Education, as one of the optional subjects for the B.A. Degree Examination. The annual admissions of even Graduate Teachers to the Collegiate section of the Training College, Mysore, did not go beyond 9 even under Departmental coercion.

The Sadler Commission no doubt recommended the institution of a Concurrent course, but that was because of the enormous demand there existed in British India for professionally qualified teachers. No such demand was visible at present in this State. Further, whatever might be the cultural value of optional Education, we could not ignore the practical Training that was necessary for those who wished to pursue teaching as a profession. Such a training could be provided only in the Post-Graduate Course and not in the Concurrent course. Hence the superiority of the Post-Graduate Course over the Concurrent.

Mr. Karpur Shrinivasrav in opposing the motion wanted to know whether it was to be understood that teachers required for the Education Department should be trained only in Philosophy and Psychology and not in Science and Mathematics also.

Mr. C. S. Balasundaram Iyer also opposed the motion. He said that the courses framed by Dr. Chinnappa seemed to him more to fit in as a course in Philosophy, that it did not fit in with Science subjects and that moreover it was purely theoretical and did not provide for practical training at all.

Mr. H. J. Bhabha explained that the Concurrent course was suggested with a view to securing more teachers trained in modern methods of teaching for the A.-V. and primary classes, that the difficulty raised by Mr. Balasundaram Iyer could be overcome by having a license in teaching inferior to the B.T. Degree. Mysore required certainly teachers in A.-V. schools who should be trained in the direct method of teaching English. That was a very great want of the Department as English was proposed to be introduced into all middle schools in the State. If the Department want a large number of trained teachers for the A.-V. Schools, a Concurrent course of teaching would be an advantage, provided it was also supplemented by six months' practical training in the Training College. To teachers practical training was more necessary than theoretical teaching. A license or diploma of teaching inferior to the B.T. Degree might be granted to those who take up education as an optional subject for the B.A. Degree examination. He thought that the principal ought to be first discussed whether the demand for a very large number of trained teachers consequent on the development of the Education Department did not also necessitate a Concurrent course

of Education in the B.A. Degree curriculam, supplemented by six months' training in the Teachers' College. He was sure that Dr. Sadler's idea was that those who took education as an optional subject in the B.A. course should ultimately aim at a diploma or license of teaching. If the University and the Department came to the conclusion that we wanted men with lower qualifications than the B.T. Degree, then a Concurrent course for education was necessary.

Mr. M. Venkatakrishnayya said that too much importance had been attached to the training of teachers, that an examination of the educational activities both outside and within the State showed that men who had not taken degrees were very successful teachers. A Concurrent course was a course which was likely to produce a sort of disturbance upon the general education of pupils. He strongly opposed the motion.

Mr. K. Chandy opposed the motion and said: "Before we decide on specialisation in the Honours course, we have to consider the material that comes up. Under a vicious system of High School Education, boys get into the University with absolutely no knowledge of any subject except their own. Under the old system, students knew a little of science, of Physiology and History, and had a correct perspective. Now a Science student knows nothing of History, and a History student nothing of the laws of nature. If they continue to specialise in their own subjects in the University, Culture will be at a minimum, especially for Science students, and they might, under this system, quite as easily become criminals, as cultured men. If English, at least, was compulsory throughout, there are some chances of their picking up some general knowledge, and getting a correct perspective. Before we decide to specialise, therefore, it is essential that the High School Education should be changed. The case is quite different in England, where it is young men who have had a sound general education that take up the honours courses. I have, therefore, to oppose the motion."

Mr. Venkataramiah thought that an inferior and a superior degree in teaching might be necessary but that the proposed course was unsuitable.

Mr. Wadia strongly opposed the motion.

Dr. R. K. Mookerji thought the scheme unsatisfactory and proposed a committee again postponing the subject. Mr. R. Ranga Rao seconded the proposal.

Dewan Bahadur Mr. C. Srikanteswara Aiyar opposed Dr. Mookerji's motion which was allowed to drop.

The Vice-Chancellor in summarising the speeches made by the several members suggested that the proposition be split up and that the 1st part, *viz.*, the institution of a Concurrent course, might first be considered. Dr. Chinnappa agreed to this.

The proposition was then put to the vote.

Seven voted for and 16 against.—*Lost.*

3. That the Post-graduate Course in Education as drawn up by the committee appointed for the purpose be approved with the modifications suggested at their meeting held on the 13th September 1919.

In moving the adoption of the Post-graduate Course in teaching drafted by the committee, Mr. J. C. Rollo said that this course had been approved unanimously by the committee, and it was only afterwards that Dr. Chinnappa suggested alterations. Later, speaking on Dr. Chinnappa's amendment and on Dr. Mookerji's proposal to remit the whole matter to the Board of Studies in Teaching Mr. Rollo pointed out that, while the Post-graduate Course recommended by the committee was complete in itself, Dr. Chinnappa's course was inadequate, since Dr. Chinnappa had transferred most of the theoretic part to the B. A. optional course, of which the Senate did not approve.

Mr. A. R. Wadia seconded.

Dr. Paul Chinnappa moved the following as an amendment to Mr. Rollo's motion.

A Post-graduate Course for the B. T. Degree be instituted open to teachers already in service and fresh graduates taking Education as one of the optional subjects for the B.A. Degree, the course being a professional one, dealing with practical aspects of Education, such as:—

(i) Educational Psychology,
(ii) Methods of Teaching,
(iii) Organization of school plant including school Hygiene,
(iv) School Management and Discipline and
(v) Practical work, including Model and Criticism Lessons, Practical Teaching and Black-board and other manual occupations.

Mr. D. Venkataramiah seconded.

Mr. C. S. Balasundaram Iyer considered Dr. Paul Chinnappa's scheme unsuitable as it was not sufficiently theoretical in this case.

Dr. Mookerji asked for the permission of the house to move the following proposition:—

That both the schemes be referred to the Board of Studies in teaching and that the scheme as approved by them be laid before the next meeting of the Senate.

Mr. C. S. Balasundaram Iyer seconded.

Twelve voted for and 4 against allowing the proposition.—*Allowed.*

Dr. Mookerji accordingly moved his proposition.

Mr. C. S. Balasundaram Iyer seconded.

Mr. J. C. Rollo opposed the motion as to both schemes.

Dr. Paul Chinnappa opposed the motion and was for immediate decision.

Sir Leslie C. Miller was for passing the course proposed by the committee.

Mr. B. M. Srikantia, Mr. K. Matthan and Dr. Mylvaganam opposed the propositions to remit the schemes to the committee.

Dr. Mookerji replied. Then votes were taken, 8 voted for and 11 against. *Lost.*

Proposition 40 (Dr. Paul Chinnappa's scheme) was then put to vote.

Five for and 12 against—*Lost.*

Proposition 43 (committee's scheme) was put to vote. 14 for and 4 against.—*Passed.*

4. That as the number of Graduates taking the Post-Graduate Course is small and a separate Teachers' College is for the present undesirable and unnecessary the Department of Education be merged in the Maharaja's College, one Professor and one Assistant Professor and one Art Instructor be appointed in the Maharaja's College, to run both the Concurrent and Post-Graduate Courses, and one other Assistant Professor of Education be appointed in the Central College to run the Concurrent Course there.

Dr. Paul Chinnappa moved the proposition as altered hereunder.

That, as the number of Graduates taking the Post-Graduate Course is likely to be small, a separate Teachers' College is for the present undesirable and unnecessary, and that provision be made at the Maharaja's College for the Teaching Course.

Mr. D. Venkataramiah seconded.

Mr. Rollo in opposing the motion remarked that the fewness of students was a merit rather than a defect.

Dewan Bahadur Mr. C. Srikanteswara Aiyar was in favour of a separate Teachers' College which was an urgent necessity. He thought that this question should not depend upon the likely number of students, that the smaller the number, to begin with, the greater the advantage for training and that, if the principle of having to wait till there was greater demand were accepted, we should have had no University in Mysore.

Mr. C. S. Balasundaram Iyer supported the motion.

M. H. J. Bhabha thought that the Teachers' College ought to be quite separate from the Maharaja's College, that the number of students need not be small, in view of the actual requirements of trained men for the High Schools and for the Inspecting staff and that it would ruin the scheme if the Teachers' College was made a part of the Maharaja's College, though, it might, if necessary, be housed in a part of the same building as the latter College. The Teachers' College must have its own Library, Reading room and Lecture rooms apart from those of the Maharaja's College, with a large and well equipped Practising High School and also a small Demonstration School attached to it. The course for the B.T. Degree Examination must be a Post-Graduate course. The Principal of the Teachers' College should be University Professor of Education and cannot be made subordinate to the Principal of the Maharaja's College.

Ten were for and 6 against.—*Passed.*

5. Dr. Paul Chinnappa's next proposition.

That, for the purposes of Demonstration Lessons and Practice in Teaching in connection with Post-Graduate Course, one section of the Fourth and Fifth Forms of the Collegiate High School, Mysore, be utilized and the Inspector-General of Education be requested to staff these two Forms with trained men, the A.-V. School at Lakshmipuram being utilized as an experimental Laboratory with the permission of the Inspector-General of Education.

Allowed to be withdrawn.

H. V. NANJUNDAYYA,
Vice-Chancellor and Chairman.